

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-16 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-9, and 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 5,995,966 to Kii et al. (herein "Kii") in view of U.S. patent 5,880,445 to Mori et al. (herein "Mori"). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kii as modified by Mori and further in view of U.S. patent 6,498,987 to Kelly et al. (herein "Kelly").

Addressing the above-noted rejections, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

It is initially noted that each of the independent claims is amended by the present response to clarify features recited therein. More particularly, claim 1 is amended by the present response to recite:

a memory including a message table and plural word/phrase tables, each plural word/phrase table corresponding to a respective attribute, the message table including an attribute column and a corresponding message column storing message data for each attribute in the attribute column, the corresponding message data being acquired from the word/phrase tables[.]

The other independent claims 11 and 12 are similarly amended.

The above-noted feature as set forth in the claims is reflected in the original specification for example in Figures 3A-3G and Figure 4. With respect to Figure 4 in the present specification as a non-limiting example, in the claimed invention a message table (see for example Figure 3G) can be accessed and different attributes indicated therein can be checked to determine whether any appropriate message is provided corresponding to the different attributes. The different messages that can be stored with respect to the different attributes can be acquired from plural word/phrase tables. Each plural word/phrase table corresponds to a respective attribute. With such an operation, a card that can have re-

recordable information stored thereon can always have up-to-date information for each of different attributes. The claims as currently written set forth a specific data structure utilizing a message table and plural word/phrase tables corresponding to different attributes to allow the different attributes and corresponding word/phrase information to be readily available and to be easily placed onto the re-recordable message card.

The above-noted claim features are believed to distinguish over the applied art.

The outstanding Office Action cites the teachings in Kii to disclose the use of different tables in Figure 4 therein. However, applicants respectfully submit that Kii does not disclose or suggest the use of both a “message table” and the “plural word/phrase tables” recited in the claims.

In addressing the limitations directed to the claimed “message table” and “plural word/phrase tables”, the outstanding Office Action states:

5. Regarding applicant’s arguments that Kii does not disclose or suggest the use of both a message table and plural word/phrase tables, examiner respectfully disagrees. As seen in Figures 3-4 and col 3, Kii does indeed teach the use of a memory that includes a message table (sentence pattern table) and plural word/phrase tables (sentence composition rule table and keyword attribute table, as well as user information databases 205-207), where the message creator accesses the message table and acquires at least one word or phrase corresponding to at least one attribute, and hence forms the message with the acquired word or phrase as recited in independent claims 1, 11, and 12 and hence their dependent claims. 35 U.S.C. 103 rejection stands. See above.<sup>1</sup>

Applicants traverse the above-noted rejection as first the presently submitted claim amendments are believed to further clarify the claims over the applied art, and secondly the above-noted basis for maintaining the rejection does not appear to be properly considering each of the positively recited claim limitations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Office Action of April 6, 2004, page 19, prenumbered paragraph 5.

In the Office Action the “sentence pattern table” in Figure 4 of Kii is noted as corresponding to the claimed “message table” and the “keyword-attribution table” and “sentence composition rule table” are noted as corresponding to the claimed “plural word/phrase tables”. Each of those positions is traversed as discussed below.

First, the noted “sentence pattern table” in Kii does not correspond to the claimed “message table”. In the claims the “message table” includes an “attribute column and a corresponding message column for storing message data for each attribute in the attribute column”. The “sentence pattern table” in Kii does not have a such a structure. As clearly shown in Figure 4 in Kii the “sentence pattern table” merely contains one column for a keyword and one column for a “sentence pattern”. Thus, the “sentence pattern table” does not include a column for an attribute, and also does not include a corresponding message column storing message data for each attribute in the attribute column. The “keyword-attribution table” in Figure 4 of Kii does disclose different attribute columns, but that “keyword-attribution table” was not cited as corresponding to the claimed “message table”, and also additionally does not include a corresponding message column showing message data for each attribute.

In such ways, the reliance on the teaching in Kii of the “sentence pattern table” does not meet the claimed limitations directed to the “message table”.

Further, Kii does not disclose the “plural word/phrase tables” also required in independent claims 1, 11, and 12.

As clarified in the claims “each plural word/phrase table corresponds to a respective attribute”. It is clearly the situation that the “keyword-attribution table” and “sentence composition rule table” in Figure 4 of Kii do not correspond to different attributes, and specifically noting that the different attributes are also placed in an attribute column in the “message table”. Stated another way, in Figure 4 Kii clearly does not teach or suggest a

column in the “sentence pattern table” corresponding to the “keyword-attribution table” and “sentence composition rule table”.

In contrast to the structure in Kii, in the “message table” shown as a non-limiting example in Figure 3G an attribute column is provided with a corresponding message, and the attributes in the attribute column are directed to different of plural word/phrase tables, see for example the word/phrase table directed to “class” in Figure 3B, the word/phrase table directed to “attendance” in Figure 3C, and the word/phrase table directed to “mark information” in Figure 3D. Again, in the claims the “message table” includes an attribute column with an attribute corresponding to the attribute from a respective of the plural word/phrase tables. Clearly that is not the situation in Figure 4 in Kii.

For Kii to meet the above-noted claim limitation Kii would require the “sentence pattern table” to have an attribute column and have plural word/phrase tables each corresponding to the indication in the attribute column; in other words in Kii the “sentence pattern table” would need to have a column to indicate “keyword-attribution table” and “sentence composition rule table”. Kii clearly does not have such a structure of operation.

Independent claims 1, 11, and 12 also recite “the corresponding message data being acquired from the word/phrase tables”. That feature is also neither taught nor suggested by Kii.

According to such a feature, and again with reference to Figure 3G in the present specification as a non-limiting example, the “message table” includes messages acquired from different word/phrase tables, i.e., the word/phrase tables in Figures 3B-3D as a non-limiting example. Kii clearly also does not teach or suggest such a feature. For Kii to teach such a feature Kii would need at the very least the indication of the “sentence pattern” in the “sentence pattern table” to contain messages obtained from the other “keyword-attribution


table” and “sentence composition rule table”. Kii does not teach or suggest that feature either.

In such ways, applicants respectfully submit that Kii does not disclose or suggest the features of the “message table” and “plural word/phrase tables” positively recited in each of independent claims 1, 11, and 12, and the claims dependent therefrom. Thus, each of the pending claims is believed to distinguish over the combination of Kii in view of Mori, and further in view of Kelly.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423  
Attorneys of Record

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
GJM/SNS:sjh

I:\ATTY\SNS\22's\220140\220140US-AF DUE 070604.DOC